

Reply to the Comment of X. Ji on “Do gluons carry half of the nucleon momentum?” [PRL 103:062001 (2009)]

Xiang-Song Chen,^{1,2,3} Wei-Min Sun,³ Xiao-Fu Lü,² Fan Wang,³ and T. Goldman⁴
¹*Department of Physics, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China*
²*Department of Physics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, China*
³*Department of Physics, Nanjing University, CPNPC, Nanjing 210093, China*
⁴*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*
(Dated: November 2, 2009)

We affirm that the proper momentum defined in [PRL 103:062001 (2009)] does respect exact gauge symmetry and is as measurable as the kinetic momentum. The physical part of the gauge field is also as measurable as the electromagnetic field. The Comment of Ji [arXiv:0910.5022] is due to a misunderstanding of our work, and a typical confusion of our gauge-invariant formalism with the specific Coulomb-gauge calculation.

The key obstacle to gauge-invariant construction of some physical quantities (e.g., the gluon spin) is the inevitable involvement of the gauge-dependent field A^μ . Recently, we proposed a method to decompose the gauge field: $A^\mu \equiv A^\mu_{\text{phys}} + A^\mu_{\text{pure}}$ [1, 2]. The aim is that A^μ_{phys} will be a physical term which is gauge-covariant and always vanishes in the vacuum, and A^μ_{pure} is a pure-gauge term which solely carries the gauge freedom and contributes nothing to the electromagnetic fields, $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$. Equipped with the separate A^μ_{phys} and A^μ_{pure} , a naively gauge-dependent quantity (such as the gluon spin $\vec{S} = \vec{E} \times \vec{A}$) can easily be rescued to be gauge-invariant, simply by replacing A^μ with A^μ_{phys} , and by replacing the ordinary derivative with the pure-gauge covariant derivative constructed with A^μ_{pure} instead of A^μ .

In his Comment [3], Ji claimed that the physical field A^μ_{phys} “is never an observable in electromagnetism as $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ are”. Here we show that this claim is due to a misunderstanding of our method. Particularly, Ji did not understand that in our formalism A^μ_{phys} can be expressed entirely in terms of $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$, therefore is as measurable as $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ are.

Mathematically, the well-defined separation $A^\mu \equiv A^\mu_{\text{phys}} + A^\mu_{\text{pure}}$ which we propose is an unambiguous prescription for constructing A^μ_{phys} and A^μ_{pure} out of a given A^μ . The properties (especially, gauge and Lorentz transformations) of A^μ_{phys} and A^μ_{pure} are inherently determined via their mathematical expressions in terms of A^μ . In the Abelian case which Ji concentrated and commented on, the defining equations for the separation $A^\mu \equiv A^\mu_{\text{phys}} + A^\mu_{\text{pure}}$ are

$$F^{\mu\nu}_{\text{pure}} \equiv \partial^\mu A^\nu_{\text{pure}} - \partial^\nu A^\mu_{\text{pure}} = 0, \quad (1a)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = 0, \quad (1b)$$

with the boundary conditions that, for a finite physical system, A^μ_{phys} approaches zero at spatial infinity (as does the field strength $F^{\mu\nu}$), and $A^\mu_{\text{pure}} = A^\mu - A^\mu_{\text{phys}}$ approaches A^μ . These equations and boundary conditions lead to familiar solutions. But Ji did not understand that

the more convenient procedure is to first solve A^μ_{phys} , and then obtain A^μ_{pure} as $A^\mu - A^\mu_{\text{phys}}$. To this end, Eqs. (1) can be arranged into the more transparent form:

$$\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = \vec{B}, \quad (2a)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = 0, \quad (2b)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} A^0_{\text{phys}} = -\partial_t \vec{A}_{\text{phys}} - \vec{E}, \quad (2c)$$

which indicate clearly that A^μ_{phys} is solely determined by $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$. The explicit solution is

$$\vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = -\vec{\nabla} \times \frac{1}{\vec{\nabla}^2} \vec{B} = \int d^3x' \frac{\vec{B}(\vec{x}', t) \times (\vec{x} - \vec{x}')}{4\pi|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|^3} \quad (3a)$$

$$A^0_{\text{phys}} = \int_{-\infty}^x dx'' (\partial_t (\vec{\nabla}' \times \frac{1}{\vec{\nabla}'^2} \vec{B})^i - E^i) \quad (3b)$$

(Here the index i takes any value of 1 to 3, and is not summed.) These explicit expressions clearly justify that A^μ_{phys} is gauge invariant and physical in the usual sense. A^μ_{phys} vanishes as $F^{\mu\nu} = 0$. Since A^μ_{phys} is entirely expressed in terms of $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$, according to the usual understanding A^μ_{phys} is as measurable as $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ are. In consequence, the proper momentum $\vec{P}_q \equiv -i\vec{\nabla} - q\vec{A}_{\text{pure}}$ is as measurable as the well-known kinematic momentum $\vec{\pi} \equiv -i\vec{\nabla} - q\vec{A} = \vec{P}_q - q\vec{A}_{\text{phys}}$, which relates to a charged particle’s velocity in an electromagnetic field.

Ji made a very weird critique that our formalism is “non-local” in the sense that an instantaneous integration is involved in Eqs. (3). We do not see what’s wrong with such kind of “non-locality” which in fact is frequently needed: The total charge $Q(t)$ in a region at an instant t is defined “non-locally” in terms of the instantaneous local charge density: $Q(t) = \int d^3x \rho(\vec{x}, t)$. The world population $N(t)$ must also be counted “non-locally”: $N(t) = \int d^3x n(\vec{x}, t)$, with $n(\vec{x}, t)$ the instantaneous local population density. Accordingly to Ji’s standard, even the electric charge and the world population are unmeasurable and unmeaningful!

A more resembling “non-local” example is the macroscopic electromagnetic fields $\langle \vec{E} \rangle$ and $\langle \vec{B} \rangle$ in a medium,

which are defined by “non-local” average of the microscopic field $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ [4]. E.g., $\langle \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \rangle = \int d^3x' f(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') \vec{E}(\vec{x}', t)$, with $f(\vec{x})$ a suitable sampling function. $A_{\text{phys}}^\mu(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\langle \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \rangle$ are both defined at a local point $(\vec{x}, t)$, but they are expressed “non-locally” in terms of $\vec{E}(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\vec{B}(\vec{x}, t)$. Such “non-local” construction is physically meaningful and useful, and nothing to worry about. One should be alert to non-locality only when it might lead to violation of micro-causality [5]. This does not happen here to $A_{\text{phys}}^\mu(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\langle \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t) \rangle$: When quantized, the commutators involving them vanish rapidly at space-like intervals significantly larger than the characteristic wavelength.

Our field separation does not interfere with any specific gauge choice. It can be regarded as just a mathematical prescription to construct A_{phys}^μ and A_{pure}^μ in terms of the full A^μ , to which any gauge condition can be assigned. Ji made a typical confusion of Eq. (1b) with the Coulomb gauge condition $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A} = 0$, especially because in practice the Coulomb gauge does simplify the expressions of A_{phys}^μ and A_{pure}^μ in terms of A^μ , thus make calculations easier.

From Ji’s critique that our field separation is not Lorentz symmetric and does not lead to proper Lorentz transformation, we can see that Ji actually does not understand correctly what Lorentz symmetry and proper Lorentz transformation are. Lorentz symmetry just requires that the basic physical laws, as expressed by the basic field equations, take the same form in different Lorentz frames. And a proper Lorentz transformations is the one that leaves invariant the basic field equations. It is nice but not required that all quantities transform in the standard manners of Lorentz scalar, vector, etc.. Indeed, massless particles with spin ≥ 1 necessarily behave in non-standard manners [6]. Concerning our separation, the defining equations (1) do take the same form in all Lorentz frames. In quantum language, Eqs. (1) commute with all Lorentz generators [7]. A_{phys}^μ must not transform as a four-vector, but this non-standard behavior, as expected for the massless spin-1 particle, is just the proper Lorentz transformation of A_{phys}^μ so as to preserve Eq. (1b) in all Lorentz frames.

To summarize: We are not doing what Ji calls “reversely-engineered” gauge symmetry. A_{phys}^μ and $\vec{P}_q = \vec{\pi} + q\vec{A}_{\text{phys}}$ have exact gauge symmetry in the usual sense.

Very much physics and convenience can be gained by separating the kinetic momentum into gauge-invariant and measurable combination $\vec{\pi} = \vec{P}_q - q\vec{A}_{\text{phys}}$. It reveals how much of the kinetic momentum is actually due to interaction with the gauge field. Moreover, it is $\vec{P}_q$ rather than $\vec{\pi}$ that commutes in two directions, and generates spatial translation for the Dirac field. The proper quark and gluon momenta in [1] have exact gauge symmetry and the calculation is complete. Historically, it took tremendous effort to establish factorization formulae to measure the quark kinetic momentum. We do not expect that measuring the proper quark momentum would be easier. On the other hand, no one has proved, and it is very imprudent and irresponsible for Ji to claim, that this measurement is impossible.

In closing, we would like to point out several minor but unfortunate mistakes in Ji’s Comment: Typo-like expression “ $A_{\text{phys}}^\mu = A^\mu - \vec{A}_{\text{pure}}$ ”, and incoherent sentence “Doesn’t $\vec{A}_\perp$ describe the physical degrees of freedom and other components of A^μ are the pure gauge part?”. Apparently, Ji did not understand that in our formalism both the physical and pure-gauge fields have four components, thus he had in mind such misconception as “the rest of A^μ other than $\vec{A}_\perp$ ”. Finally, Ji even miscopied the title of our paper to be “Does Gluons Carry Half of the Nucleon Momentum?”.

-
- [1] X.S. Chen, W.M. Sun, X.F. Lü, F. Wang, and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 062001 (2009).
 - [2] X.S. Chen, X.F. Lü, W.M. Sun, F. Wang, and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 232002 (2008).
 - [3] X. Ji, arXiv:0910.5022 [hep-ph].
 - [4] J.D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics* (Wiley, New York, 1999), 3rd ed., Section 6.6.
 - [5] In fact, in the literature locality often means the same thing as micro-causality. See, e.g., S.S. Schweber, *An Introduction to Relativistic Quantum Field Theory* (Row, New York, 1961), pp.722-723; F. Strocchi, *Elements of Quantum Mechanics of Infinite Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985), pp.66-67.
 - [6] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields I* (Cambridge, New York 1995), Section 5.9.
 - [7] E.B. Manoukian, J. Phys. G **13**, 1013 (1987).